

CONFIDENTIAL

White House
Roger Fisher
DRAFT: LKW:laq
28 Jan 56

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. DULLES

SUBJECT : Administration's Position on Location of Proposed New CIA Building.

25X1

1. As you know, a serious effort is being made to have us reconsider locating our proposed new building in the District of Columbia. Roger Fisher, particularly, is trying to divide the Administration on this issue, and if we are not careful I think that he may succeed in at least making the Administration appear to be inconsistent. In all of our discussions with Fisher and others we have taken the position that the Administration had exempted us from dispersal, but at the same time felt strongly that we should not locate in the District of Columbia, but, rather, on the fringes of metropolitan Washington.

2. On Thursday, 26 January, Mr. Innis Harris, Assistant Director for Plans and Readiness, Office of Defense Mobilization, telephoned to clear a letter with me which he was preparing for ODM to send to Roger Fisher. With some difficulty I think that I was able to persuade him to phrase his letter so that it would appear to be an Administration policy. I learned, however, that Mr. Brundage of the Bureau of the Budget had written a brief note to Fisher saying that he was referring this matter to the Office of Defense Mobilization and also that Governor Adams had responded to a letter from Fisher. Later exploration with the Bureau of the Budget confirmed that the Bureau had prepared a draft reply for Governor Adams' signature. I have now seen this draft. It says, in substance, that once an exemption from dispersal is granted the Agency

head must balance the requirements for efficient peacetime operations against the need for post attack operational capability and other means for insuring it. It leaves a definite impression that the Administration has taken no position as to whether we should locate in or out of the District and that this decision is entirely up to the Director of Central Intelligence. I emphasized to the Bureau of the Budget the necessity of coordinating such replies with us and of keeping the Administration's position firm.

3. I think that the following summarizes information, which is more or less public knowledge, that would indicate that we actually would prefer to locate in the District:

- a. On 4 April 1955 when we had decided to abandon consideration of Langley, I told the National Capital Planning Commission that we probably would prefer a location in the District of Columbia.
- b. During our Hearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Robertson asked you why you couldn't build in Washington and you replied, "Senator, I would prefer personally to build it in Washington. I have, however, consulted with high authority, and in view of the traffic problem in Washington the theory is that our building should be outside the District." At this same Hearing Senator Ellender asked you why it would not be practical to locate in West Potomac Park instead of buying land somewhere else, to which you replied, "I would

be glad to do that. We discussed that with the Executive Branch of the Government and the feeling is very strong that the CIA building should not be located where it would further aggravate the traffic problem of the District."

4. As to expressions that we could not locate in the District, the following are pertinent:

- a. Our meeting with the President on 7 May 1955. (Tab A)
- b. During our Hearings before both Chairman Vinson's Committee and Senator Stennis' Committee we had to defend our exemption from dispersion standards, it being the general feeling that we should disperse. It was following these Hearings that we met on 14 June 1955 at the White House with Governor Adams and others and obtained confirmation of the Administration's position. (Tab B)
- c. On 15 June 1955 we dispatched letters to Senator Stennis and Chairman Vinson requesting that our legislation be amended to provide for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway so that Langley would be a possibility. In these letters we again defended our exemption and reported that we had reviewed the proposed location with "Dr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, a representative of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and others." The reason for this was that

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

both of these Committees had rather urged dispersal upon us.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~